

AGAINST VIVISECTION.

A LECTURE

BY

ANNIE BESANT.

*The Theosophical Publishing Society
Benares.*

1903.

Price Three Annas.

PRINTED BY FREEMAN & CO., LTD.,
AT THE TARA PRINTING WORKS, BENARES.



AGAINST VIVISECTION.

HARMLESSNESS IS THE HIGHEST RELIGION.

BROTHERS,

I SPEAK to you this afternoon with some feeling of pain, nay, with some feeling also of shame, that I should find it necessary in a country like this to speak on such a subject, and to plead against the practice of vivisection in a land like the one in which we are to-day. Our Chairman has just reminded us by an appropriate quotation of that ancient and most true saying that we should not injure, that we should not slay, that we should not harm. Such has been the law of religion in this land from the mouth of all its greatest teachers. Here, at least, the duty of compassion, the duty of tenderness towards all that lives and feels, the recognition that the best description of the Brâhmaṇa is, that he is the friend of every creature, are generally admitted. The fact that the greatest teachers of the law which India has given to the world were those who laid most stress on the divine quality of compassion, and embraced in

one vast brotherhood everything that lives and moves ; this fact of the past, this law of religion, joined to the dictates of at least a common humanity, ought to be enough to make it unnecessary to plead on the Âryan soil for mercy to the brute, and to make it unnecessary to plead to Âryan people that man owes a duty to his younger and more helpless brethren, and that that duty cannot permit him to torture, to maim and to destroy.

In speaking to you on this subject, I have this hope, which I should not dare to have were I addressing a Western audience. I think possibly that in this land but little is as yet known of the practice of vivisection, that the steps by which it has developed may be to you unknown, and the history that lies behind it may have been by you unread. I have noticed that here in India, an attempt is being made to introduce the system under what may seem the comparatively harmless guise of the so-called Pasteur Institute ; that under that there may be a beginning of this practice and under the pretence of saving men from terrible disease, this practice may begin among the medical profession, and among the scientific men of this land. That it could not begin, I feel tolerably sure, if everything that is implied under it were known, and, therefore, I shall, in speaking to you about vivisection,

say a few words as to what the name really means. For while it is painful both to speakers and to hearers to speak in words of this scandal and disgrace to civilised humanity, at the same time the voice of warning is necessary in order that by knowing what has been done, the very beginning of the practice may be prevented amongst us. Let me then first in outlining the subject make a few remarks on its growth in Europe, then say a word or two as to the way in which in England at least that growth has very largely been checked. Then turning from the practice, I shall want to delay for a little time on the point alluded to by our Chairman, the conflict of opinion amongst experts as to the good which may be derived from the practice, so far as dealing with disease is concerned. And then leaving those lower levels, I shall dare to appeal to the higher law which forbids the gaining of knowledge by cruelty, which forbids men to stain their consciences, in order that their intellectual knowledge may be increased. Such is the outline which I propose to follow, the sketch which I shall now begin to fill in.

First, then as to the practice itself as we know it in Europe. It may be said to have begun by the somewhat insidious means of introducing into the human body attenuated poisons, so that by the pre-

sence of the attenuated poison a disease might be checked whose power in the body depended on that poison being introduced in a virulent form. This poison was introduced into the body, in the attempt to check disease, not by attention to the laws of sanitation, not by building up a sound body, by feeding it with pure nutriment, by surrounding it with pure air, or by observing the ordinary laws of health. Instead of taking that sane and wholesome line of teaching, some of our medical men thought it best to meet disease by introducing disease, and then by introducing it into a healthy body in an attenuated form, fight against it with the best of health in the body into which it was artificially introduced. There appeared to be a chance of checking the scourge of some contagious maladies, and in this way, it was argued, benefiting the human race. Of course, the main instance of this is the instance of small-pox. That was opposed, first, by inoculation, and then by vaccination, and under the pressure of medical opinion, vaccination was made compulsory. You are probably all of you aware of the agitation that is now being carried on in England against the enforcement of this practice, against introducing into the human body a filthy fluid, supposed to guard it against small-pox infection, but very often carrying with

it germs of disease far more loathsome than the small-pox, so that a strong opposition has arisen, and it seems likely that the compulsory law may be done away with. I have not time to dwell upon that particular part of the argument, beyond just reminding you of this, that the introduction of foul matter is not the right way to combat disease. If you want to make the body healthy, you should follow the laws of health, cleanliness and purity, and show care in the ordinary matters of external decency and external life. You will oppose disease in that way far better than by poisoning the body. For by the beginning of this practice by introducing one disease after another, as some doctors desire to do, you set up a new cycle of mischief, and simply substitute one form of mischief for another. But so far as inoculation and vaccination were concerned, no very great torture was employed ; experiments for the most part were on human beings, and to some extent at least they voluntarily submitted themselves to the process. But as material science grew stronger, and as the sense of moral duty grew weaker, there gradually came to pass amongst the scientific men of Europe, especially in France and Italy, a practice of trying to wrench from nature her secrets by cutting open the bodies of living creatures, watch-

ing the action of drugs within them, and then from this watching of the action of drugs, passing on to inflicting all kinds of tortures, not for the sake of discovering even remedial measures against disease, but merely to increase theoretical knowledge, and to enlarge the intellectual treasure of the human mind. After the vivisection which was followed in order that this action of drugs might be noticed, came the vivisection which simply tested the powers of endurance of the creature, which tried to take what were called the moral qualities of the animal, and see whether those could be subjected and destroyed by physical agony ; so that when we read the records of what has been done by men of science, both in Italy and in France, we begin to wonder if human beings are concerned, or devils incarnate in human shape, taking joy and delight in torture. The practice is divided into three great classes. The first that I allude to, where less pain has been caused, is the action of drugs on the lower animals with a view to using them on men for the curing of diseases. These experiments, while cruel to some extent and futile, as many of us believe, are by no means simply all we mean under the title of vivisection. The second class of experiments in vivisection, as now carried on in Europe, are those

that come under the head of experiments for the instruction of students, and of young medical men: young students in the hospitals, lads who most certainly by no experiment they could perform could ever add to the sum of human knowledge. They repeat the experiments of advanced scientific men in order to watch with their own eyes the results which they read of in their textbooks. For instance, they will read in the textbook they are studying in the course of their education, that an animal, under certain conditions, will show certain movements of the muscles, will show certain effects of the nervous system, will show that by taking off the skull, by exposing the brain, by then stimulating the brain in different parts by cutting, or burning, or virulent poisons, which cause sudden and startling contractions, that certain motions in the animal may be caused, and that certain muscular results may be brought about. This is not done for the gaining of new knowledge, but is merely idle repetition of facts well established. For instance, a dog will be taken and laid living on the dissecting table, then the nerves will be exposed along the neck and under the skin of the legs, and so on; or the bones of the skull are removed and certain parts of the brain stimulated; and while strapped

down in this condition, a sudden injury may be caused by the application of a red-hot iron, to a particular part of the brain, and the dog will bark, and then the Professor will brutally say to the public : "See how we can make the dog bark by stimulating this particular portion of the brain." Now if it be of the smallest value to any human being to know that a dog barks when a particular portion of the brain is in action, surely it must have satisfied intellectual curiosity to have proved this once for all ; but to do it over and over again simply to prove what everybody knows, is not only to torture the animal ; but to brutalise the consciences and hearts of the young men, who learn to see agony with indifference and curiosity as they watch the writhings of the tortured brute. What kind of education is that for men, who are to be doctors in families ? What sort of education too for young men, who should grow up tender-hearted and compassionate towards all ? Not only will they perform such experiments again and again, but in order to teach young men to see agony without flinching, to see the flow of blood, to listen to the cries of anguish, to see the writhings of the tortured creature and still go on unmoved and untouched, they will take a highly organised animal like a monkey, a dog or a horse, one of those

creatures whose nervous system is very delicately organised, because only there do you get this extremity of pain which gives rise to this special effect upon the animal ; and they will keep an unhappy creature like this alive and suffering for a couple of days together, while some ten or twelve young men gather round the miserable brute, dissect it piece by piece, dissecting every nerve trunk, every nerve thread, and all the while the wretched animal is strapped, so that even some contortions are rendered impossible which might injure the operators—not in any sense such as could relieve the brute. And if you read what these people say in defence of their practices, if you take such answers as those given by Dr. Klein before the Commission which investigated the practice of vivisection, you will find him absolutely saying without the least sense of shame, without a notion that he is disgracing himself by the statement, that his use of an anæsthetic, his use of any drug which prevents the creature from feeling when it is being tortured, depends entirely on the danger with which the animal may threaten the operator, and in no sense on the painful nature of the experiment which is going to be performed. “If,” he said, “for instance, I take a large hog, I do not use an anæsthetic; but if I take a large dog, I then use

an anæsthetic, because it may bite, or if I take a cat, I use an anæsthetic, because a cat will scratch." Those creatures that may hurt an operator, those may gain the mercy of an anæsthetic that stupefies; but if the creature be helpless, no thought of mercy interposes to check the sufferings of the brute. If we ask why the young men should dissect the living animals, then we are told that it is good for their practice, and it is good for them to mark the quivering of the muscles as the living muscle shrinks under the touch of the knife. It is good for them that they should not easily be upset by the sight of pain or by the flow of blood; it gives them delicacy of touch, it gives them skill in operating. To operate on the dead body is not enough; there must be the living body with its quivering nerves, and tortured muscles, in order that they may work on that and thus prepare themselves for operations on human beings in the future. The answer to pleas of that sort from every man who has in him the slightest touch of the divine compassion will be: "I will not buy that skill by torturing these helpless creatures; I will not buy that skill by inflicting this anguish upon miserable brutes; I would rather suffer myself to be a more clumsy operator, than I would take skill purchased by the agony of these help-

less creatures, and made more perfect by the pain the operator has learned callously to inflict." And mind you, as a matter of fact, the best operators of the western world have not been trained in this school. It is a comparatively modern school, in which the young generations of medical men have been trained. But the older men, whose skill of touch has made them famous throughout the world, managed to acquire that skill without inflicting the torture of the vivisection tables. But even these experiments, horrible as they are, ghastly as it is to think of a creature kept in this agony for 42 hours at a time, as they keep horses in the Vivisection School in France, using them for these repeated experiments, still worse than that, showing deeper depth of depravity, worse hardness of heart, is where the higher animals are taken, with those commencing qualities in them which ally them most closely to man, with the beginnings of maternal affection such as you find between a dog and its puppies, or the cow and its calf. Pre-eminent among these higher animals in the West is the dog, for in the West the dog is made the companion of man to an extent which here is not common, and the result of that close companionship, of being brought up, say, with the children of a family, being constantly made much of and

caressed both by young and by old, has had as its outcome the stimulating of the higher qualities of the animal—love of man, courage in defending him, and, above all, an absolute fidelity which trusts man as a man might trust in God. The dog trusts his master. The master may injure it, it will imagine the injury is for its good, and if you take a wounded dog that knows you, you need never be the least afraid that in hurting that animal in order to help it, as you may do if the leg is broken, and you have to set it, you need never be afraid that the dog will turn upon you and bite you. Even in the moment of the agony you are inflicting, the creature will trust you, and believe that, though it knows it not, you are acting kindly and for its good. That quality of trust has been developed in the dog by many long years of companionship with man, of gentle and human treatment, and therefore the dog has been one of the chief victims of the vivisector in connection with what have been called the experiments on the moral feelings of the brutes. One vivisector in order that he might see how much torture a favourite dog would endure without anger, without trying to bite, without in any sense showing resentment, took a favourite dog, strapped it down in the torture trough, and then proceeded to torture the creature

by every kind of experiment which a diabolical cruelty could suggest. He simply tried to inflict pain upon it by driving red-hot irons into it; everything that most could agonise, that man inflicted upon that helpless brute, with the result that when the brute was just dying, when the torture at last had exhausted its frame, it turned round and with its last effort it licked the hand of the vivisector—licked the hand of the man that had tortured it, not believing even in its agony that the man could mean to do it wrong. Many such cases have occurred. One such to my mind has in it an element which seems worse than physical cruelty, because it tortured what in the brute is one of the highest feelings—the germ of a higher nature—the love of the mother for her young. A vivisector took a female dog that had a litter of puppies, and after cutting away from the unfortunate mother the breasts whereby the puppies would be fed, submitted it to the most fearful agony, and then made the puppies cry for the mother, in order to see whether in the midst of the agony the mother's love would answer to the cry of the young, and whether some effort would be made by the poor creature to reach the puppies that were crying for her. And the man wrote down the details of that experiment. Honestly, I dare not repeat them to

you, for I dare not trust my tongue to repeat them one by one, so frightful were they. Let it suffice to say they were tortures such that only the greatest cruelty could imagine, and through them all, in the worst moment of the anguish, right up to the very point of death, the mother's love in the brute triumphed over the torture, and without legs, on bleeding stumps, on bleeding breasts, she struggled to reach her little ones, hearing their cries of pain, and endeavoured to succour and to help them. I say that when a man can stoop so low as to take that mother's love of the brute, which has in it the promise of its future evolution and the growth in it of a higher nature, and set his intellect to devise cruelty, and set that against the instinct of maternal love, that such a man has lost all right to the title of human being, and is far lower than the lowest of the brutes, for he has prostituted the humanity that should be his glory, and has fallen lower than any brute could do.

Another class of experiments still for the increase of knowledge, useless and worthless, are those which have tried how much an animal could suffer without actually dying, and one man, an Italian, Professor Majendi, whose name seems to soil the lips that utter it, devised a very clever machine—for the man had brilliant brain power

which might have served his race—and he used it in order to devise a piece of apparatus in which an animal could be placed, so that every part of the animal could be tortured at the same time; that by a laboured system of pincers and racks, and hot irons and knives, and saws, and various other instruments of torture, an animal should have every portion of its body tortured at one and the same time. What a noble use for the human intellect! Splendid aim to which to put this gift of human reason, which should raise man so high! When he had perfected his instrument he placed animal after animal into it, doing the same experiment over and over and over again, and keeping on the torture until the animal died under the agony.

Then he wrote down in his diary that it had lived so many hours under “subjection to extreme pain,” and in order that no doubt might remain he gave special names to the kinds of pain he inflicted, “moderate” and “great” and “agonising,” and he noted down in his experiments, under the proper head, the time during which the tortured animal lived. What good can such knowledge do to any human being? What purpose can be served by brutality such as this? Yet that man’s name stands high in the world of science in Europe because of the experiments he has performed, and this empty

knowledge that by the experiments he gained. Another thing he would do would be to take a rabbit and place it in a hot oven with a fire burning below and the oven of iron. Then, slowly heating the oven, he would see how long it was before the animal expired in the hot chamber. Horrors like this went on in town after town, in school after school, hospital after hospital; men of science examined their pupils in the details so as to be sure they had performed the experiments for themselves. Then at last such were the books that were published, containing the statements of the men themselves, not the hot words of the platform orators, not the statement of some foolish and weak-hearted objector, but the books written by the vivisectors themselves, the details of their own cruelties, that the public awoke.

When these books were translated into the English tongue and were read by the English people, such a cry of horror and indignation went up from the public heart, that Government was compelled to interfere and to appoint a Royal Commission in order to examine whether these horrors were perpetrated upon English soil. That Commission met, and you can read if you choose, its long record for yourselves. The result was that an Act of Parliament was passed, placing Vivisection under extremely strict supervision, only to be performed by

the highest men of science, only to be performed if they held a special certificate from the Government, every experiment to be placed on record, drugs to be used, whenever possible, to stupefy the animal, and the animal to be slain the moment the experiment was over, so that it might not linger in torture as had been hitherto the fashion. Such was the English law, poor enough, miserable enough, but still an enormous advance in checking the practice as it had grown up among our scientific men, and as it still is practised on the Continent to-day.

The law has stopped the torture of animals for mere experiment and it has stopped the torture of animals for the instruction of the medical student. It has placed some kind of check on the practice generally, although it has not stopped it; and if men now want to perform the worse cruelties, if now they want to repeat the most barbarous of the experiments, they have to leave the soil of England, they must at least go away from lands under British law, and then they may still in France, in Italy or in Germany, carry on these horrible experiments and torture the brute creation at their will.

Such then, very roughly stated, has been the practice of vivisection in Europe, and my reason for dwelling on this growth in that practice is this, that you may know what is coming when the proposal is

made to you for the establishment of a Pasteur Institute, and know the value of the argument that very little pain is inflicted upon the animals; they will tell you that the injection of the poisons causes very little pain, and by this they will try to blind your eyes. Once permit the practice to be established; once permit the experiments on living animals to be done; and you open the door to the whole of this barbarous cruelty, and are likely to tread the same path which has disgraced the European nations.

Oppose it from the very outset, say that on the Âryan soil, this last shame of Western civilisation shall not be permitted to plant itself, that at least you will keep your country pure from that last disgrace, and not permit the tradition of mercy to give way before the torture of materialistic men of science. For surely one ought to be able to say that no religious man could thus torture the brute. It is the triumph of materialistic science; it is the last step of the science that denies all duty, and that regards strength as justifying abuse; it is the law of strength that claims that man is mightier than the animal, and has a right to use his might as he pleases. That is the claim that is practically put forward, that the claim that the religious man has the duty to negate.

I say that the results gained are doubtful to

begin with, because the action of drugs on the lower animals by no means proves their action on the differently organised human frame. You cannot judge of the action of a drug when you compare that action in one of the lower creatures and then from that argue to its effect on man. The constitution is too different ; the custom of the life too diverse. You cannot argue really from the one to the other, and hence the discord, the opposition, the controversy, that are arising as to the effects brought about by vivisection.

Many of the leading doctors of England will tell you that vivisection is only misleading and inaccurate. Vivisectors have introduced blunders in practice, instead of increasing our knowledge of the treatment of disease. And it is not only that, the action of drugs on the brute is not necessarily the same as their action upon a man, but it is also the case that when you torture the animal you set up a special nervous action ; you quicken the circulation by increasing the beats of the heart ; you change the state of equilibrium of the animal condition by the nervous shock, and by the agony, the terror, the horror, the anguish, that the creature is enduring. From such a tortured body with all its functions disordered by pain, no articulate and reliable answer can come to the questions which are put to it

as to the effect of the drug upon it. If you want the secrets of nature you must work in a gentler and humaner way ; you must watch the action of drugs on a diseased creature, and not on a creature that is at first healthy and then tortured and agonised in the dissecting trough.

If you take the creature and throw it out of gear, the answer is disorderly and not orderly. You cannot distinguish between the effects of the torture and the effects of the drug ; you cannot be sure that some of the abnormal results that should follow the administration of your drug do not really come because of the torture and the knife which have preceded the administration of the remedy. So it is found that when these experiments have been relied upon, and when, with a diseased human body, the treatment has been followed, which was supposed to be useful because of the observed phenomena in connection with the vivisected animal, it was found over and over again that the results were totally misleading, and that as we might have thought by reason, so it was shown by experiment, that if you disorganise a physical body by torture, the results gained from that body are abnormal and misleading to the last degree. So that amongst large numbers of the medical profession, vivisection is discredited, even by its results ;

not by compassion, not by a sense of duty, not by an appeal to conscience, not in any sense because men are too tender to practise it, but because it is a dead failure and has not given the results which once were hoped for. Now, if we find men with hard heads and stony hearts saying that they will vivisect because of its utility to men, then there is no good appealing to the heart they do not possess, to the compassion which they have thrown from out of their nature. We must appeal to them by the hard logic of facts and point to the failure which has followed on the experiment. Where a man has lost his heart, we must be content to appeal to the head; and so by scientific arguments, by an appeal to the phenomena themselves, vivisection is condemned, because vivisection is a failure, and you dare not apply the results obtained from your tortured creatures to the healing of the disease of man.

If you would heal disease you must study disease and the action of drugs on the diseased body by patient observation, by careful record. Gradually also one may hope by the development of the highest intuition, medicine may become what it once was, not only a science, but a religious function, the great function of the healer applied to men, the healer who is the spiritual man who under-

stands what he is doing and is able to see as well as to reason. But until that quality is again evolved in our humanity, let our doctors learn their profession by patient observation of disease, by the effect of the drugs they use on the body suffering from disease. Let them cure the animal rather than agonise him ; let their work be to lessen pain and not to increase it, to cure and not to destroy. Seeing that they have failed by cruelty, let them learn by mercy, and see whether nature, whose law is the divine compassion, will not give her secrets to the enquirer who is tender and diligent, rather than to the man who would wrench them from her by torture and by anguish, cut them out of her by the knife, draw them out of her by the red-hot iron, and murder her more helpless children in the search after knowledge.

But suppose their arguments were true, suppose it were true that you and I, my brothers, could be saved from a disease that threatened the body by the torture of the brute, could be rescued from death by the agony of the lower animal. Are you prepared to pay that price for a few years longer of the body? Are you prepared to trample on mercy in order that your physical life may be made a few weeks or months or years longer than otherwise it would be? I have learnt that there is in

man a divine life which refuses to outrage it in any one of its manifestations. Need I plead to you in the divine name of compassion against knowledge which is gained by torture and by trampling on the duties of man? Do you remember those words which fell from the lips of Shri Kṛṣṇa, when speaking to His disciple He described the man "who sees me in all things and all things in me"? One may draw a picture in one's own mind of Shri Kṛṣṇa in every creature living; He is the life of the brute; not only in man did He say He was living; His devotees see Him in all things and all things in Him. And dare the Hindu who believes Him to be divine, who regards the words from His lips as words of truth, dare that Hindu strap an animal in the torture trough and dissect it for the so-called advancement of science? There is the appeal that to the Hindu heart should go farthest. There the appeal that to the Hindu heart should prove the strongest. For what is that we have learned? That the divine love is not confined to men only, but includes within it everything in the universe; that the universe is an emanation from the divine, and that God cannot be excluded from one atom of the universe that He has made; that His love is through all, living in all, working in all; that there is nothing that lives—and all things live, remember—

there is nothing that lives, nothing that feels, that does not take its life and its feeling and its thought from the one divine Consciousness out of which the universe has grown. So have our fathers taught us, so have our Rishis proclaimed to us, and shall we in these later days trample on the words that are divine in their mercy, and deny that sacred law which forbade injury even to the lowest, the weakest, the most helpless? Of all the religions the world has known there are two that stand out supreme as teaching this bond of unity, as springing from divine love, and as excluding nothing from the all-embracing circle of the divine compassion. The first of those religions is the ancient religion of the Hindus, the ancient wisdom which has ever taught the sublime lesson of the bond that makes the universe one. Therefore, was it said that to abstain from injury was the supremest law, because that is to reverence the divine, not only in man but in the brute, not only in man, but in everything that feels, and even beyond the range of feeling.

Every man was meant to be an educator of the lower world and to gradually help the evolution of everything that is lower than himself. So it was that the Hindu teaching this gentleness, this kindness, this seeing of the divine in all, this rever-

ence of the law of love in even its lowest manifestations—that was the mark of the real devotee, that the sign of the man who knew God because he knew Him everywhere.

Springing from Hinduism in later days came her daughter, Buddhism, which taught exactly the same duty to the lower creatures, and the bond that excluded from it nothing that was able to feel, which could be conscious of pleasure or pain. And shall the land which had those two mighty religions change its law and alter the nature of its people? Shall it take the knife and stain it with the blood of the helpless, and allow the Âryan soil to be polluted by these methods of an infidel and atheistic science? Nor is that all we must remember. There is no such thing as the right of the strong over the weak. Strength does not give right; it gives duty. The stronger you are, the greater is your responsibility; the stronger you are, the greater your duty of service; you are strong in body that you may defend the weak, when they are suffering, not that you may trample upon them. If you begin by torturing the brute, you will easily pass on to the torture of your fellow-man; for when you have once brutalised the heart and soiled the conscience by killing the divine instinct of compassion, you will use your strength against men as well as against the brute.

and oppress your weaker brother men as well as your weaker brothers of the animal kingdom. And so you should learn that strength means duty ; the stronger you are, the more responsible are you in the world ; whether your power be of your body or brain, that power is yours to help and not to harm.

We look to those higher than we are, to the divine Intelligences above us ; we look to Those for help, for strength, for assistance, when our own strength breaks down. But how should we dare to appeal to the divine strength to help our weakness, if we use our strength to injure those feebler than ourselves ? Will a man dare to come from the torture trough of the vivisector, and ask for divine mercy and divine compassion in order to lessen his own burden ? How shall divine strength flow out to those who use strength for injury ? How shall divine compassion flow through those who deny compassion to those weaker than themselves ? Nay, I have read in the sacred books of men, and I have known men in modern India, who had come so near to union with the divine, men who had so developed in themselves the spiritual nature, who had so evolved in themselves the divine love, I have read of them and met them, men who could go out into the jungle and the tiger would roll harmlessly at their feet and would play as

domestic creatures. Why? Because they loved and in their love had become divine; because nothing will injure him who injures not; nothing will wound him who wounds not; nothing will show destructive power against him who destroys not. Those who love are guarded from injury, for that love flows out around them like divine armour; no hatred can pierce through it, no wild animal would strike them to mutilate or to harm. The Yogî walks unharmed through the jungle, the snake will climb round his neck. There is the man become divine, and that is the ideal you and I should be aspiring to. He may stand high above us on the ladder of human progress, but he has climbed there step by step, and he has climbed by love and not by hatred, by compassion and not by torture. That ideal that all things love and that nothing will injure, that is the ideal of the divine man, and if you or I are to become divine, we must cultivate in ourselves these divine qualities; and we kill them when we encourage brutality against the lower animals, or if we take results which are derived from the infliction of torture. Rather would I say to you: make this the law of your life, that no knowledge that has been gained by cruelty shall be utilised by yourself; that you will not touch the polluted thing nor permit it in any sense to come within the

circle of your life. There is only one way that men can turn toward God ; there is only one way in which the divine life can expand in us and develop, and that is by loving everything that surrounds us, by helping and by cherishing everything. Whenever we see a wound, we must try to heal it ; whenever we see a sorrow, we must try to lighten it ; whenever we meet a pain, we must try to stop it ; and if we can take it upon ourselves and set the sufferer free, then indeed the law of love is becoming perfected in us, and we ourselves are beginning to be divine. Put the two pictures before yourself and judge which is true : on this side the man who tortures the brute, who seeks to gain by suffering, who in order to avoid pain for himself will torture myriads of animals, will kill hundreds of the lower creatures ; who in order that he may be safe will throw others into danger, that he may enjoy, will give others pain. Look on that man, picture him in your mind ; and on the other side place the man who wherever he sees pain, tries to take it on himself, so that the weaker may not suffer ; who wherever he sees a sorrow springs forward to share it, in order that even if he may not lift it off his brother's heart, he may place his own heart under the same burden, and by sharing the weight by sympathy may make his brother's load

less heavy than he felt it to be before ; the man who would rather suffer himself than give pain to another, rather give up life himself than inflict death upon another. Think of that man, and say whether it is not a diviner picture, and whether it does not appeal alike to the intellect and to the heart of man.

If that lower ideal be accepted, degradation waits on the nation that accepts it, and destruction will mark her for its own. For they who slay shall themselves be slain ; they who torture shall themselves be tortured ; they who throw out the divine life from their hearts will have to learn by bitter agony the nature of the pain they gave ; so that as they would not learn sympathy by love, they may learn sympathy by anguish.

The brutalities that we see in the streets, every good man should set himself against ; the brutalities that we see in the streets of Calcutta, ought to be opposed and checked. The cruel beating, the unnecessary blows, the barbarities exercised on horse, on bullock, on donkey, the man of love must set himself against, not only in the extreme form of vivisection, but against every brutality to the lower creation. We are to train them, not to terrify them ; we are to educate them, not to degrade them ; we are gradually to raise them, not to

lower them—that is our function in the world. In Europe all good men are setting their faces against this evil; the excesses that have been done have roused even callous hearts to put them down. Do not permit them to begin here; do not allow them to commence on this soil. Let the soil that has been made sacred by the feet of the Avatâras be kept pure from at least this last outrage, from this final scandal of civilisation, other than your own. Keep the soil as sacred as you can—much it has been polluted, much it has been stained; keep it free from the blood of the tortured animals, and let not the atmosphere ring with the cry of the agonising brute. Your pity in the past, your gentleness in the past, has made your own natures the gentlest upon earth; and to you who are still Âryans in heart, to you I make an appeal, that you will keep this land of the Devas free from this last scandal, and this last disgrace.

Enough we have suffered in the past, enough we have fallen, enough we have been degraded! Do not erase from the scriptures their lessons of compassion and mercy. Do not allow it to be said that cruelty is approved by the modern sons of the Âryan soil.